1

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2002

CORONADO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY: Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870

ATTENDANCE:

John Locke
Bob Geilenfeldt
Bill Collins
Daniel Cordero
Rich Wong
Marilyn Field
Charles Perry
Robert Campbell
Jim French
Anita Boyd
Foster Marshall
Alan Clark
Steve Sullivan
Bill Ulmer

CORONADO, CA., THURS., FEBRUARY 28, 2002, 6:40 P.M.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Good evening. Welcome to the 73rd Restoration Advisory Board meeting for the City of Coronado.

I want to thank all of you for persevering in getting here. The location has obviously changed.

The meeting minutes for last November 15, 2001 are available to anyone. If you have not received them, I believe there are copies on the board. I imagine most of you have already seen these.

Do any of you have any questions or any alterations that you would like to bring up about the minutes of the meeting for the last session?

Do I hear a motion to accept these as discussed?

DR. MARSHALL: So move.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Second?

MR. CLARK: Second.

MR. GEILENFELDT: All in favor? Accepted.

The first item on the agenda is Mark Bonsavage's replacement for Site 5 Removal Action. Rich is the one who's going to do this; right?

MR. WONG: That's right.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Rich Wong.

MR. WONG: Thank you.

For those that don't know me -- there's some new faces in the crowd today -- I'm Richard Wong. I'm the project manager with the IT Corporation.

What we're going to talk about today is the removal action that's undergoing at IR Site 5 - Unit 2, and particularly we're going to discuss the portion of the removal action that pertains to the excavation of the VOC impacted soil at that site.

This is the site, if you remember, that we've had quite a bit of visibility on, and I just wanted to show you how that project went and where we're at now and the next phase of the project.

As always, I've got some introductory slides to give you a feel for where we're at with respect to a big picture perspective. You've seen some of these slides before, so I'm going to go through them relatively quickly. If anybody wants to ask me questions, just feel free to stop me.

Site 5 is -- what we're going to do today is talk a little bit about the background and give you a brief discussion on the location

history, some of the waste practices that contributed to the contamination at the site. We'll talk about our objectives with respect to the removal action, and some of the regulatory interaction that we've had on this project.

Again, the focus of this talk tonight is to talk about the excavation of the highly contaminated soils at the site, some of the challenges that we had to overcome, and the solutions that we developed.

We'll also talk about the very important topic of community health and safety. That was one of the big issues with respect to this removal action, and we'll talk about where we're at now with respect to the transportation and disposal of the soil that we have excavated at the site, and last we'll talk about what's coming up next on this removal action.

IR Site 5 is located in this red rectangular area, located on the runway approach to the major runway at North Island and approximately 1800 feet east of the City of Coronado.

A little bit different look before North Island was joined with the rest of the land mass. This area in between the two land masses was

referred to as the Spanish Bight. That was filled during the mid '40s, and this location contributes to the geometry of the soil conditions as well as the contamination that exists at the site.

With respect to the background, the contamination at the site is attributable to disposal of liquid hazardous waste and to two former hazardous waste pits. It's created a plume of approximately three and a half acres in size. The contamination at the site is greater than 100,000 micrograms per liter of total VOCs. We have vinyl chloride at greater than 80,000 micrograms per liter. What does that mean? It means that the groundwater is highly impacted by chlorinated solvents.

The geology at the site, again, is dominated by the fact that the site is located in the former Spanish Bight embayment. Our groundwater is relatively shallow. It's about five feet below ground surface, and the total contaminated zone is only about 10 to 15 feet below ground surface.

Previous work at the site has indicated that the plume is relatively stable and is degrading naturally. However, there is some

indications that this plume has the potential of reaching the slough, which is the sensitive environmental receptor at the site.

So the removal action objective is to reduce the mass of VOCs both in the soil and in the groundwater, allowing the natural processes to continue the degradation of the contamination of the site.

This figure just shows the location of the former hazardous waste pits, which are indicated by the two red rectangular areas; the VOC groundwater plume, which is depicted by this irregular shape. And just for reference, IR Site 5 - Unit 1, the initial landfill was indicated in the present golf course area.

In advance of the removal action we conducted a pre-treatment study. We really wanted to get a handle on the geometry of not only the contamination, but also the geology as it has a direct bearing on how we will clean up the site.

Part of the sampling program included collecting groundwater samples from existing wells as well as using the Navy PWC SCAPS rig, which is an innovative device that allows us to take a number of samples in four days, which allowed us to

characterize the site relatively quickly.

We've seen this before. This is just showing the results of that subsurface investigation, the two former waste disposal pits shown by the rectangular areas. And just for reference, the green color is the approximate distribution of the contamination both in the groundwater and in the soil, and we saw that the highest contamination was in the location of this eastern most pit.

So based on our study, we were able to determine that the soil in the eastern most pit had a high potential of recontaminating the groundwater even after we had conducted the groundwater treatment phase of this project, so it was decided that we needed to remediate the soils in the eastern most pit.

In addition, it was determined that these soils could adversely affect both human and environmental receptors.

With respect to regulatory issues, this is just to remind you that we went through the full regulatory process on this CERCLA time critical removal action. DTSC, Dan Cordero, is our lead regulatory person on this project.

AM stands for Action Memo. That was issued in 1999. That's the document that the Navy prepares that formally documents that they're going to undertake a removal action.

Our Remedial Action Work Plan was finalized in February 2001, and that incorporated both the pilot test that we spoke about at other RAB meetings, and our RAW addendum that pertained to the health and safety plan addendum prepared specifically for the removal of the soils at the site.

In July of '01 the DTSC issued the Draft Negative Declaration. Subsequently, we had a RAB meeting over at the library on August 13, 2001 and during that meeting, we discussed several issues. And at that point it came to light that there was a lot of concerns both from the citizens of Coronado as well as the base regarding this proposed removal action.

We were able to get through those concerns. We addressed each and every concern, both written as well as verbal that were presented at that RAB meeting, and the Final Negative Declaration was issued in October of '01 which approved the Navy to move forward with the time

critical removal action.

Now, with respect to the excavation of the soils at Site 5, really there were a lot of challenges that we needed to overcome and several obstacles, one of which was really the Naval North Island site approval process. They're very concerned. They don't want to have any of the removal action adversely affect Naval operations, and we also had high visibility with respect to the residents, both on and off the base.

This removal action was following shortly after the unfortunate incidents of 9/11, and there was some heightened security that we had to contend with as well. And we also had many communications both between the Navy and the citizens of Coronado, and those were handled through briefings with the Navy Public Works officer as well as a couple of newspaper articles pertaining to the proposed work at North Island.

So really we had on this particular removal action a lot more visibility with respect to the public, and those issues that the public were most concerned about were truck traffic through the community of Coronado and the possibility of being impacted by airborne

contaminants that could be released during the removal action itself.

One of the other things in terms of base operations that we really had to take into consideration was the fact that this particular site is located on the main runway approach at North Island. And although our mission was important, which was to help restore the environment, we always take a second back seat to the national security interests that this base plays.

Some of the solutions -- what we came up with to overcome some of the obstacles, what we talked about -- really were to have meetings with the public, the city fire department, and any other stakeholder that was interested in the removal action.

We also prepared a series of correspondence. We prepared a Fact Sheet and a communication plan, and in the communication plan we presented some frequently asked questions in lay terms that really described what we intended to do, when we intended to do it, and what were the potential impacts. And, more importantly, if there were any questions, we provided points of contact

so any concerned citizen or person on the base could have their concerns addressed.

But more importantly, this removal action was able to be accomplished successfully through proper planning and taking into account all the possible contingencies that may arise during the work, and the fact of the matter was that we agreed to conduct this work in one evening.

This is just a copy of the public notices that went out to the citizens of Coronado both in the "Eagle" as well as in the "San Diego Evening Tribune."

And here are the cover sheets to the Fact Sheet as well as the Communication Plan.

Now, let's go ahead and get into the removal action itself. The removal action started on December 14th at about 4:00 in the afternoon.

As with every project that is conducted at North Island, safety is the first and foremost priority, and what we saw was our tailgate health and safety meeting.

Here's a view of the actual soil removal in progress. Work was conducted with a track mounted excavator, two rubber tired loaders, and a series of trucks carrying sealed bins.

This shot in particular is taken from the golf course and gives you a feel for the darkness that we were contending with. As you remember on the 14th of December, that was the night of the freak rainstorm and the high winds. And those winds, in fact, helped us with respect to keeping the potential of fugitive emissions from making it to the City of Coronado because high winds help dissipate any fumes that were created.

In this particular scene we're seeing one of the sealed bins being transported to the excavation area. And what we did on this particular project, instead of just casting the soils onto the street and using loaders to put them into trucks, we direct loaded the bins and sealed the bins as soon as possible to help minimize any sort of release of airborne contaminants during the excavation.

So our goal on this project was to remove approximately 600 cubic yards of contaminated soil to a depth of approximately 6 to 7-1/2 feet below ground surface. Again, it was to remove the highly contaminated soils that we could not treat with our proposed in situ chemical groundwater treatment that we're planning later.

There's a close up of -- let me stop

it here. We actually came across some debris within the excavation, and we could see a crushed drum that's located in the excavation area.

MS. FIELD: A crushed what?

MR. WONG: Drum.

MR. CLARK: 55-gallon drum?

MR. WONG: 55-gallon drum.

So in addition to liquid waste, there was some construction debris that was also placed in those pits during their use.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So, Rich, this was all just sandy soil.

MR. WONG: Very much so. Right.

MS. FIELD: I notice when I see a person in there, they're not wearing any protective gear to prevent inhalation.

MR. WONG: We were carefully monitoring the airborne contaminants immediately within the vicinity of the excavation as well as away from the excavation. We'll have another slide or two a little bit later, but we have certain levels -- thresholds that if we're below, we don't need to wear protective respiratory gear. If they reach above those thresholds, then of course we were prepared. We actually had self-contained breathing

apparatus available to us to use at that time, but thankfully, we didn't need to use those.

MS. FIELD: And why would you say that the high winds were a good thing? I would have thought the high winds might have been a bad thing because they would have blown -- whatever got in the air blown it towards the city.

MR. WONG: The winds will blow contaminants towards the direction they're heading to. However, the higher the wind velocity, the more dilution that occurs. So really the highest concentrations at the city would be achieved when we have relatively low wind. That would keep the contaminant mass together and bring it towards the receptors when it -- you know, we were seeing winds at over 20 knots. There was no geotechnical debris even within five feet of the excavation at that point.

MR. GEILENFELDT: You're saying that the 20 knot wind dissipated this gaseous form, whatever it is, that is created when they're removing this --

MR. WONG: Right.

MR. GEILENFELDT: You dissipate this, but you say the wind was not blowing into Coronado?

MR. WONG: It was. One of the things we

did, Bob, during the excavation effort was to monitor both the wind speed and direction during the whole removal action. That's just part of the way we document how the work is conducted.

MR. CLARK: How many of these containers did you pull out of there?

MR. WONG: We saw about six drums within about 700 cubic yards.

MR. CLARK: I'm talking about the containers that you brought in.

MR. WONG: We brought in 60 containers. We filled 51.

MR. CLARK: So most of the contaminant was right in that one area.

MR. WONG: That's correct.

So in this shot we've reached pretty close to the bottom. Our objective again was to excavate the contaminated soil to the top of the standing groundwater. If we found the contamination below groundwater, it would be treated by our proposed groundwater treatment. So our idea was to get rid of all the soil that was highly contaminated above the groundwater, and we achieved it.

You can see that we have -- I don't

know if you can see it here, but you can see some standing groundwater at the excavation.

One of the other components that we undertook was to install some conveyance piping. One of the things -- since this is one of our most highly contaminated areas -- since we have the excavation available to us, was to install these horizontal pipelines so that we could inject chemicals directly onto the hottest area without having to depend on vertical wells. We have much more efficient distribution of our treatment using horizontal pipes.

MR. CLARK: Are the pipes perforated?

MR. WONG: The pipes are slotted.

So now we're probably at about 2:00 in the morning at this point, and we're getting close to about a foot below finished grade with our backfill effort. So these are clean soils that have been brought in from another site at North Island and are used as backfill.

MR. CLARK: So your base was gravel then?

MR. WONG: Our base was gravel, right, to about 3 feet below the ground surface.

And this is about 6:00 in the morning and we're essentially done. We accomplished what

we had to do. We got the soil out of there, put it in bins, and started the backfill operation before people were getting up in and around North Island and probably Coronado.

This is actually the following Monday. We backfilled up to finish grade on Friday, took the weekend off, came back on Monday, finished the road restoration on Monday. So essentially within three days we were completely done with this excavation effort.

And that's just our paving crew just finishing up the last bit of asphalted pavement.

MR. COLLINS: Those posts on the side or what appear to be posts, these posts were really protective or markers for the wells that we installed. Each one of those horizontal pipes that you see going across has a vertical member so that we can attach onto it later on with chemical oxidation materials and inject it that way.

MR. WONG: Right.

So I just wanted to spend a little time on the community health and safety issues and how we really did try to take into account the public's concerns with respect to exposure issues as well as our workers' health and safety issues, and one of

the first things what we did -- we talked about this before. We actually conducted a human health risk assessment using the contamination data that we had and tried to predict what would be the maximum concentrations that somebody in the City of Coronado might experience. The fact of the matter is that during our complete monitoring, we had nondetectable readings about 50 feet away from the excavation, and the City of Coronado is about 1800 feet away. There were no exposures at the city boundary.

One of the other things that we were able to do was conduct this excavation at night. We took advantage of the lower temperatures and the higher winds. That was just fortunate for us that we actually had a little rain storm there, but that was also intended to help minimize the creation of airborne contaminants.

We also had a series of engineering controls in place. There was some moisture conditioning that we did during the excavation that helped suppress the vapors, and we also had a vapor suppressant chemical available to us to use if we needed it. But, again, the concentrations were so low we did not have to deploy that, but that was

just a simple way of being ready if we did have higher concentrations, to be able to suppress the concentrations and still finish the work.

As we mentioned earlier, we used vapor tight, closed-top bins. We direct loaded those bins and closed those bins as soon as possible to minimize the amount of vapor released.

We also conducted a very elaborate perimeter monitoring program. We had one individual right in the immediate vicinity of the excavation. I think, Marilyn, you pointed out the gentleman wearing the yellow jumpsuit. He was monitoring directly within that area. His main goal was to identify any high concentrations, alert the perimeter monitoring team, and keep an eye on that. Again, we did not reach any sort of concentrations that required us to go in with protective respiratory gear.

MS. FIELD: How do you keep -- with winds that high, how do you keep the soil itself, let alone the vapors, from blowing around? Did they moisten it down or something?

MR. WONG: Right. And as we've mentioned before, the contingency planning included if we had very high vapors near the borders of the City of

Coronado, we were prepared to backfill the excavation immediately and take a step back and not continue with the proposed excavation scenario for the city.

MR. CLARK: What were most of the contaminants in there?

MR. WONG: Primarily associated with former solvents, and so we have PCE and TCE, and those were two most common solvents.

This is just part of the air monitoring system that we used. This is the individual that's in the excavation area. He's using a hand-held device, a flame ionized detector that allows him to look at total volatile organic concentrations in the air. He was the first line of defense. He's monitoring continuously around the excavation.

The second line of defense that we deployed was the use of portable gas chromatograph/mass spectrometer devices. These devices are able to identify and determine the concentration of each airborne contaminant that we suspected at the site. These are very expensive pieces of equipment, and we had two of these instruments deployed at the site: one in and around the excavation area, and one that went routinely

along the border of Coronado in between the excavation that we did at Coronado as well as in front of any base housing that was in the area.

Then as the bins were taken to our bin staging area, we also looked at using an FID or flame ionized detector, whether or not we were releasing airborne contaminants at our temporary storage area. So we didn't see any of that, but we really went out of our way to try to document whether that condition existed.

So in summary, we were able to excavate approximately 700 cubic yards of relatively highly contaminated soil. We saw during our waste characterization process concentrations on the order of about 50,000 milligrams per kilogram of total VOCs in these soils. So this is a case where excavation really did make sense.

Of the 51 bins that we filled, 38 were classified as RCRA hazardous waste, and those bins are currently in the process of being transported to the appropriate permitted facility. Thirteen of the bins have been classified as California hazardous waste, and those will be disposed of at the facility in the Central Valley.

One of our big items that we really

tried to accomplish was to minimize the truck traffic through the City of Coronado. There's a picture showing our truck route that we're using. The trucks that enter the base come across the bridge onto Third, go up to the truck gate, work its way across North Island, and pick the bins up. With the help of base security, we opened Gate 5, and they come down Ocean down the strand and up 5.

Our plan, and we've been sticking to it, is to keep truck traffic to no more than five trucks per day.

Before we truck that stuff off the base, we make sure we check it thoroughly, and this includes looking at its total weight. You've got to make sure that the gross vehicle weight is within DOT limitations, and we also inspect the truck for safety, and the Navy Public Works Center helps us with that.

MR. CLARK: So do you have one bin per truck?

MR. WONG: What's happening now -- originally we were hoping to put two bins on each truck on the way out. However, the soil is a little bit heavier than we anticipated, and it's taking one truck per bin.

MS. FIELD: So why is it taking so long? At the rate of five a day, 51 trucks, it would have been done a long time ago.

MR. WONG: There's a whole -- I skipped an important part of it. We have to collect samples from each of the bins, conduct chemical analyses on each of those samples; then, depending on the results of those samples, they may actually have to run additional chemical analyses to further define what the waste characteristics are because this is a very regulated portion of what we do, and we cannot send soil to the wrong facility.

So there were several iterations of chemical analyses and data analysis that we had to undertake before we fully understood where each of the bins should go to a proper facility.

MS. FIELD: That raises another question: What's the difference between RCRA haz waste and California haz waste?

MR. WONG: Well, simply, RCRA hazardous waste has much higher concentrations, and it represents probably a greater risk to the environment. So these are RCRA permitted facilities that they're going to, and these are carefully managed facilities, and in fact, some of

the soil that we've created required treatment before internment into a landfill.

So RCRA is just simply higher contaminated soils that require some sort of treatment usually before internment. California hazardous waste is still contaminated but within the guidelines that go into a different type of facility, and it's a little bit more cost effective.

MR. GEILENFELDT: These five were sealed for a long time after 9/11. Is that still sealed?

MR. WONG: It's still sealed. Banks, too, are --

MR. GEILENFELDT: Marilyn had brought that up.

MR. WONG: Thanks to interaction with Southwest Div and the base, we were able to work an arrangement with base security so when we finish our inspections and we've gathered the trucks up at Gate 5, base security opens it up.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So they're still following that exit route that you're showing in the chart.

MR. WONG: Right. We're still using it.

So if you notice here that this truck is a little bit wider than the trucks that we've

used to manage the bins during the excavation, and the hope again as previously stated, was to try to get two bins on each truck, but we can't do it.

MS. FIELD: So out of curiosity, when you have these North Island bins and you have to test what's in there, how do you know that what you're testing in one portion of the bin is representative of what's in the entire bin?

MR. WONG: That's a great question. There are a lot of different strategies.

It can be deployed to assess the waste characteristics. But the fact that we took one sample from each bin is probably more than what's done on other sites where they might -- the other sites might be using a statistical approach and say "Well, let's take a sample from every third bin," for instance.

So what we tried to do was take the sample from the same location at each bin and then say that that sample represented the contents of the bin, and that was just a decision that was made.

MS. FIELD: And on that basis with that sample you've characterized the bin as either RCRA haz waste or California haz waste.

MR. WONG: Right.

MS. FIELD: That sounds like a highly imprecise --

MR. WONG: Well, in fact, it's better than what's done on most projects.

MR. COLLINS: In this case where we took a sample for each one of the bins, we had 50 some samples to look at and have a good idea of what we had. And we had all the results back before -- I take it, before any of the bins were going.

MR. WONG: Absolutely.

MR. COLLINS: So if we'd have thought something was out of whack, we could have looked at it, made an adjustment, and in some cases we actually had to go back and have other samples to run other tests on. So this confirmed the types of material we had.

Now, when it goes to the landfill, too, before they let it in the gate, before they bury it, they take other samples and they run it again. And if it's within limits, they keep it. If it's grossly different, they notify IT, make arrangements to send a truck and come get it and take it to the right place. So there's a double-check on it.

MR. WONG: And in addition to that, Bill, when we finish the chemical characteristics, we prepare what's called a profile. That profile extends both to the Navy as the generator, Navy Public Works, as well as the proposed facility. Both of those parties have to agree that we've properly characterized the waste. If they disagree or they have a question, then we need to answer those questions to their satisfaction.

Again, no waste facility is going to accept the liability of accepting the wrong kind of waste. It's just not going to happen. Their permit is worth millions to them, and they're not going to risk it on taking one bin that's been improperly characterized.

MR. COLLINS: Right.

MR. CORDERO: I'm currently working on some other State site that ends up being an IR site because the city profiled it wrong. They sent it to a waste facility they thought was proper for it and when they assessed it again at the facility, they rejected the waste and sent it back.

So there is a double-check on every step of the way, so that what Richard is saying is true. They did take one from each, and they made

the assumption that some of the waste is probably RCRA -- probably only in that section RCRA hazardous waste. The rest of it could have been California waste or actually just pretty clean soil. But they pay for a whole bin, so it can go both ways, either too hazardous or not clean.

MR. WONG: And this is just a picture of the temporary scales that we set up. This is along Augusta Drive towards the 19th hole. We're simply weighing each and every axle of the truck so that we can determine the gross vehicle weight and make sure that we're not sending an overweighted load on the roads.

In terms of inspection, this is five trucks gathered in the vicinity of the entrance to Gate 5 here. It's hard to see with the lighting. But a representative of the Navy Public Works is taking a look at the safety of each of these vehicles as well as the manifest, and that's the last check in terms of the proper characterization. He's looking at the profile. There's been a manifest that's been prepared. He signs off on it. Each truck driver has a copy of that manifest, and that's a very important aspect of what we're trying to do is make sure that this material is taken off

the base in a safe and proper manner from a regulatory standpoint.

So in terms of what's next, that's really all I had to talk about, the excavation. If there's any questions with respect to the excavation, I'll be happy to take those now.

But in terms of what's next, we're planning on conducting a full-scale groundwater treatment at this site using chemical oxidation by Fenton's reagent. We've had a couple of RAB meetings on that, but essentially what that involves is the injection of hydrogen peroxide -- which is this portion of the equation -- in the presence of an iron catalyst produces this reaction. And what's important to keep in mind is that it produces the hydroxyl radical, which is probably one of the strongest oxidants that we could produce, and it will certainly destroy many of the contaminants in situ.

So using this technology, we can avoid some of these transportation issues that we had to contend with on terms of the excavation phase.

This treatment will also include baseline soil and groundwater sampling so that we can check the efficiency of the treatment. And

following the baseline sampling, we'll conduct the full-scale chemical oxidation treatment. When we feel that we've achieved our removal action goals, which for this project is to achieve 95 percent contaminant reduction in the subsurface, we'll conduct post-treatment solely on a groundwater sample to confirm that.

Here's a conceptual well field that we presented in our Remedial Action Work Plan, and it's following the same theme with respect to the soil excavation. We intend to treat the most contaminated portion of the plume first and see what happens after that, if we're effective at reducing the mass by 95 percent. Our hope is that through natural processes that this plume will contract and will actually accelerate the natural degradation of the groundwater contamination at the site.

That's it. Any questions?

MR. GEILENFELDT: One question: Did you deem it necessary to have some escort protection for these units as they're transporting materials down Ocean Boulevard into the City of Coronado?

MR. WONG: No.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Was that a factor that the

fire chief discussed with you?

MR. WONG: No. No. In fact, Coronado can be often -- you know, since Gate 5's been closed for a while, they've been using that as an area to park and they just let the trucks pass without any interaction whatsoever. It's been very, very low impact. We really have not interrupted things too much.

Any other questions or comments?

MR. CLARK: On the wells, is that going to be like the steam type of thing injection or how are you going to do that?

MR. WONG: It will be an injection well. However, the process that we're using is not a thermal process. It's a chemical process.

So these chemicals, they're oxidants that will actually go into the subsurface, disburse, and actually break the bonds between the molecules in the subsurface and actually render them to relatively harmless byproducts.

So it's a true destruction where the steam process is a volatilization. We capture those vapors and then we treat those vapors upstream. There is no waste treatment in this technology. It's all done below grade.

MR. CLARK: It's all in the soil. Then how do you figure that? In other words, all these chemicals and everything are going to be there. How is this going to affect like a section to bring that other material outside of those 16 wells back in?

MR. WONG: That's a great question. Really, what's happening is that the source area, the highest contamination both in the soil and in the groundwater actually creates the effect of the dissolved phase plume which we see on the fringes.

So if you reduce the source, then we'd expect through natural processes that those lower contaminated areas will start contracting over time.

They're actually micro-organisms that exist at the site. It's been demonstrated by other consultants that are acting on the contaminants. It's just that we have so much source out there that it really would just take way too much time to actually degrade and expect that to occur in a reasonable time.

MR. CLARK: So by getting the major part of it, then that lessens the amount for the micro-organism soil.

MR. WONG: Right. Exactly.

MR. CLARK: Thank you.

MR. WONG: Any other questions or comments?

MR. COLLINS: No.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Thanks for an excellent presentation.

MR. WONG: Unfortunately, my mom's just gotten out of surgery, so I'm going to leave now and try to see her before visiting hours are over.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Thanks for coming.

Our next presentation is by Honorable Bill Collins, Site 9 Removal Action Update.

MR. COLLINS: My first discussion item on the agenda is to talk about Site 9 and the seemingly never ending removal action that's going on out there.

What I want to tell you is that since our last meeting, we've installed even more equipment. We found a problem with one of our boilers which had deteriorated over time over the couple years that we used it, so we bought another one and installed it, and we also had a few other problems. We worked through the mechanical stuff.

Right now our oil field is ready to go. Our free product wells are ready. Our steam wells,

injection wells are ready. What we have to do, as usual, is put more money into this contract. It seems to eat up every dollar we can give it and we still have to go out and insulate the steam lines so that we can keep the heat in the pipes just before we inject them into the ground. We still have to do that, and it will take a little while to do.

And we also have to construct our water treatment plant, and we will then also build concurrently the irrigation plot which is, I believe, around four acres. We'll have three different kinds of plants on it and it will handle the pretreated water. This water will be clean enough to discharge to the regular sewer lines, and pretty much would have been clean enough to discharge right to the bay, so it's in pretty good shape.

The plants will take care of the water problem. They'll consume the water. The water itself will evaporate. The contaminants will remain in the plants, and periodically the plants will be harvested and then put into drums and shipped off, treated just like the soil was whether or not it was hazardous or clean enough to be just

clean waste at Miramar.

So right now we're actually looking at doing some contract action hopefully in March, and we'll get this full show on the road. We probably won't get any steam into the ground until April. It's looking up.

I still anticipate it will run for another year and a half to two years, though, before we shut the system down. And by that time, though, we should be ready to go out and do some other remedial activities at the site, some that will be mighty impressive and some will be extremely low tech.

Anybody have any questions on Site 9? Okay.

MR. GEILENFELDT: You're next, Mr. Collins.

MR. COLLINS: Site 11. I have a handout for Site 11.

And if you want, you can read the handout. What we've done is recently prepared an FS -- a Feasibility Study for Site 11 where we proposed to the state and to the public various ways to clean up the site.

We're done with the investigation. We're looking forward to picking some remedial

alternatives, getting public acceptance and state acceptance on this, trying to make it cost effective, protect everybody, protect everybody's wallet, to make them good enough so they'll have long-term effectiveness, too.

We also look at the safety, too. We want long-term safety. We want short-term safety, too, when we're actually out building the thing. We don't want to pick something that has long-term safety and long-term cost effectiveness that is so dangerous to put in the ground that we lose people that way. So we have to balance short term and long term, so we work with that.

We try to always reduce, if we can, the mobility of contaminants, the toxicity of contaminants, and the volume. We try to work on those things. And if we can do all three, we really have success -- the best of success, and then of course, we have to make sure it's still cost effective.

So OU 11 is in the middle of the island. I think everybody who's been on one of the field trips has been there. It used to be called Green Acres. It's the old industrial waste treatment plant area. Many, many years ago it used

to stink. It's pretty pleasant now.

We used to dispose of industrial waste and oily waste out there, and it wasn't like Site 9 where we disposed of it, dumped it on the ground intentionally and left it there. This is a place where we segregated the waste, attempted to treat it at the plant, and then we would ship it off to facilities that were designed to take various types of waste, whether it was California type waste, oily waste, industrial waste, RCRA waste -- however you want to look at it.

Unfortunately, our ponds leaked, so we had essentially the aftereffects coming out of Site 9. It had gotten into the groundwater and gotten into the soil. Not nearly as bad as Site 9, thankfully.

So what we're out there to do now is to pick our cure. We've done investigations out there since 1984. For things that are minor it's just trying to find where the groundwater is, see if there's a little bit of contamination or what. And all through time becoming concerned that there was significant contamination so we had to enlarge our investigations.

Finally, around 1996 we actually

finished our investigations for our program that we have run at Southwest Division. Additional sampling took place for other little solid waste management units that are out there, some no bigger than an area 10 by 10 foot down in the ground ten feet, a little unit that processed waste. And when the Public Works Center went about closing these little units, the state required them to take samples. And, of course, in our program we take anybody's data if we can get it. It doesn't cost our program any money to use their data.

We built out of this into a huge data package so we could come up with the decisions we're going to show you tonight. And they're not final decisions. I should call them proposals.

In January we sent off the FS for review, and it's two volumes. It's about this thick, though. It might put you to sleep. If you don't get a chance to read this or you don't want to read the FS and give comments to the state or the Navy as to what we ought to consider, you can wait a few months, hopefully, and you'll see the proposed plan that will come out next -- that will be a very skinny document, more like six pages, a lot friendlier -- reader friendly, community

friendly, and you'll be able to read that and see what we're proposing.

We'll have narrowed the things down even more than tonight. That's where we want to go with it.

Our project out there, we want to protect the groundwater. I don't know if you've ever heard me say that the groundwater path to the bay is actually well over a hundred years -- it took more than 150 years to get to the bay, that's if it could.

And what we found through our studies in the FS is that the groundwater contamination got out about 2000 feet, maybe. It seems to have stagnated. We found through looking at it from monitored natural attenuation like we're doing at Site 5 that the chemicals themselves are deteriorating, breaking apart, and the plume is actually starting to shrink, which is nice. And we also determined that after 30 years, it wouldn't have gone any farther anyway. So we're in pretty good shape with that.

So what we're planning to do or what we have proposed is a bunch of alternatives. Of course, we always consider no action. EPA demands

that we do this. And really no action is just for a baseline. You have to compare it to doing nothing. Usually it says you walk away from it. You don't monitor it. You don't do anything. So it's a zero dollar line, and then you compare everything else.

One thing we're considering, though, and far more practical is some site improvements, institutional controls, removal of the concrete and the debris, filling in the basins and ponds with clean fill, blacktopping of areas, imposing institutional controls -- some things like fences -- and monitoring.

An institutional control, too, is kind of law. There's an order out and nobody will dig. Nobody will install a groundwater well here, and things like that. The rest of this we can call engineering controls to some extent.

Alternative S3 -- this is with soil only -- involves capping also, but it involves a cap put over a much larger area of the site, and that's pretty much it. They're very similar. The type of cap in alternative S3 is engineered so it's multilayered, about 18 inches thick, and it's designed to do certain things including drain -- drain the water away from the waste, and also

underneath the cap we designed it so it drains water away so that you can catch it. Just in case the cap should break or crack, you would catch anything -- rain water or whatever got through -- that would drain off and you would catch it, too. That way you don't have any additional leaching of any contaminants into the groundwater, although you couldn't ruin our groundwater at this site. It's already shot.

Now, when you get to groundwater, once again, we considered nothing -- doing nothing. We also looked at Groundwater Alternative 2 as an option -- and that's monitored natural attenuation -- and, again, institutional controls.

We know that we have to go out and replace some of the wells at the site. We don't like where they're positioned within the aquifer. That's the body of water. We want them a little deeper. And so we're going to select certain ones of those, install the deeper wells -- they're still shallow wells but they're deeper than before -- ten feet deeper. We will retain a few of the old more shallow wells so that we can use the chemistry data that we get from them to compare with the previous 12 years worth of data that we have. So they will

be the link with the past, and then we'll also have some wells that are 10 feet deeper, which will provide another set of numbers that we can use in one particular area so that you will have samples up here, samples down here in the same well, but they're both shallow and you can see how similar or dissimilar they are, and that will also give us some new wells for the future for monitoring.

We're monitoring those wells for a minimum of 30 years. We're also going to put in some very deep wells, just to monitor a portion of the deep plume, which really hasn't gone more than 100 feet in 20 years.

Alternative 3 is a little more deluxe. It's everything we were going to do in groundwater of Option 2. In 3 we're going to go out and actively treat some of the hot spots. Like we've treated the hot spots or we're treating the hot spots at Site 5, we were going to treat these hot spots, also. It will take several months when we do it, maybe nine months. It will be a one-time thing, but it will knock down the concentrations again so that monitored natural attenuation can take place more effectively.

That's pretty much it as far as what

we're planning to do with the site. We did find out that there was some guidance on RCRA-based closure. Actually, we're trying to -- we're talking to the state about that. We proposed this in our plan and it really affects more of the soil, and hopefully possibly might allow us to go with the soil option 2, I believe, the less stringent cap.

What's next? Hopefully, in mid-March we'll get our comments back from the state as far as the FS and what we need to do and whether or not we've explained ourselves sufficiently. We worked with this almost on a monthly basis for two years with the state, so there shouldn't be too many surprises.

And then once that's done, we'll finalize it and make any corrections that are necessary, and then we'll go about preparing our proposed plan, and I'm sure you'll be more involved when that comes along. It won't be as tedious in a way as this, the Reader's Digest version. There will be just a few things outlined as far as what we're going to do -- what we propose to do. So we're always seeking concurrence from the public and the state. And the state is not going to let us install something or finish the project with

something that doesn't serve the needs of the law and the people of California.

Hopefully, we'll see that in the late summer, maybe the fall. Okay?

MR. GEILENFELDT: Bill, Marilyn Field brought to my attention a process that's being used in Boise, Idaho. It's called BET. I'm sure you're familiar with that.

I talked to John about this, and he said it was -- your term was ORC. It's a natural inhalation process out of Boise, Idaho.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Is that something that would apply here?

MR. COLLINS: No, not really. We did look at something like that. We tossed a lot of ideas around.

MR. LOCKE: The acronym was bioenhanced treatment?

MR. GEILENFELDT: Yeah. Bioenhanced something.

MR. COLLINS: Well, we're going to enhance our treatment using sodium lactate, which is putting fluid in the ground, essentially, and letting the microbes have a party.

MR. LOCKE: Bioavailability enhancement treatment.

MR. FRENCH: We're familiar with that. That's actually a licensed technology. It comes out of the Idaho National Engineering, and actually the individuals that patented that technology have been consulting to us on the Groundwater Alternative 3, so it's a very similar approach.

MS. FIELD: This is not something you would use at this site?

MR. FRENCH: It really is the same. The patent which they have for the bioenhanced technology was specifically with the use of the sodium lactate to treat non-aqueous phase contamination, and we don't believe we have the non-aqueous phase contamination in the shallow aquifer. So we're basically using the same technique, but we don't really need to get a license because the patent doesn't apply to our specific site.

But it's definitely the same principles -- a lot of the same principles and the same chemicals.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Thanks, Jim.

MR. CLARK: Bill, you mentioned something

about you can monitor different depths in the well?

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. CLARK: In the same well?

MR. COLLINS: Yes. In this case we'll have wells adjacent to each other, so we'll monitor one shallow interval with one well and there's another well we can monitor -- we'll install the screens so that we monitor down here another ten feet.

But you can design a well to run the full length, and then with a diffusion sampler -- and I described that at one of the RAB meetings once. It's essentially a series of plastic bags all holding special water -- deionized water, distilled water, very clean water -- and you can install them two feet apart head to toe -- and as the water migrates through there, some of these chemicals, especially diffused through the plastic -- they'll go into the plastic, they'll diffuse back out of the plastic -- but after a while, after a few weeks of being there, the water inside is the same as the water outside. And then you pull up your string of bags and recover your samples and send them off.

That's a new way of doing things, and we did that in Operable Unit 20 on North Island and

then we tried it at Site 9 and a couple of other places. It worked fine. Another government agency, the USGS, actually came up with that method and they published a paper. We shared that with the state. It's really neat. If you need a sample every two feet, it's a handy way to do it because wells are so expensive. If you install a well just for two feet and then you have to come in and you want the next two feet, you install another well, you'll run out of money before you get what you need.

But in this case we don't need that many samples. We certainly don't need that kind of breakdown, groundwater stratigraphy.

MR. CLARK: Thank you.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Thank you, Bill.

I'd like to interject one little item here before the Coronado Flower Show. I'd like to introduce Steve Sullivan and Bill Ulmer to talk about the NASNI RAB Web site. We've had some information that they presented earlier on this.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm handing out the RAB exam. Wouldn't that be awful if we had to take a test? I mean, people from the community that come to these meetings every two to three months. I can see some

of the faces around this room. There's a lot of information for us to try to figure out and a lot of technology to consider in the scheme of things.

And so as my seque in bringing that up is part of the reason why we have this portal. If some of you folks were here at the last meeting, we talked briefly about the purpose of the portal. The portal's to help provide an additional community link with the RAB board members and the RAB program here at Naval Air Station North Island.

The key thing is to provide a community link to resources, information, and a lot of the things that have been discussed tonight. The technology and the information that both Bill and Rich discussed tonight, a lot of that information is very difficult to digest over an hour and a half period of time. This will give you an opportunity to go to a place where all that information is aggregated and easily accessible for you to go ahead and review and become more familiar with some of the technology and some of the information that they've discussed here tonight.

In addition to that, I'm basically providing an overview and Bill's going to actually walk you through each of those areas.

You'll be able to access the meeting archives.

Community outreach is basically an area where you'll be able to communicate with other areas of our government -- local government regarding issues that impact environmental remediation and other entities that may come into play here within the RAB portal or the RAB meeting, I should say.

The case studies actually cover a lot of different types of activities that occur -- remediation activities that occurred at NASNI.

The Forum is a place for you community members to develop a dialogue on specific issues. For example, I know that you brought up a couple of issues that you were concerned about. That might be something that you can develop a dialogue with somebody else in your community, and then take that information once you've come up with maybe some thoughts, and go to the area called the "IR Connection." At the IR Connection you'll be able to pass those thoughts or communicate those questions about potentially technology, up and coming issues regarding remediation or IR activities at NASNI, and direct those to key people

on the board or other folks that are affiliated with the RAB, and then get a fairly real time feedback on those issues or concerns.

So it gives you a better opportunity to communicate about the issues that you're concerned about regarding the RAB. Again, because the meetings happen every month or two, oftentimes something might pop up that you're interested in discussing and may forget about, and you missed an opportunity to communicate. This will help you do that.

Other than that, I think I'll have Bill go ahead and kind of walk you through this site. There's a couple of key things I'll point out on this main page. There will also be a link to the NELP program, the Navy Environmental Leadership Program, which often has shown or demonstrated some of the technologies that have been discussed here tonight. So go ahead, Bill.

MR. ULMER: Thank you, Steve.

Basically all I want to do is kind of walk you through the general format of the Web site and give you the opportunity to add additional input. Maybe you feel that something else needs to be added to that area or something should be

deleted.

I know we're going to go for finite approval here of this Web site sometime in the next few weeks, if not within the next month, and this is where we're trying to get some feedback from the committee as well as the public as to what you think these pages should involve.

So Steve talked a little about the Home Page. It's just a page that starts the whole Web site.

The second page in your handout is the meeting archives. Both the meeting minutes and the transcripts are all PDF behind these little links. Well, my computer just went blank on me. That's why you have handouts.

MR. SULLIVAN: He's actually using a CD-ROM, so it's not actually directly linked.

MR. ULMER: The picture being that you can get the PDF forms about the meeting minutes and meeting transcripts. You can currently do that on the Region's site, but you would also be able to do that here.

Community outreach, fact sheets, public notices, photo galleries. Currently working with the IT group to get some images. Some great places

have that. The videos that Rich showed, you'd be able to download that and look at that.

Community outreach Web links, which Steve talked about, we've selected eight. If anybody has any additional ones that they think should be added, we're more than welcome to hear that input.

I think the next sheet beyond Community Outreach is your fact sheet archive. We currently have 13 fact sheets. These are also PDF all linked up, and I'm sorry about the images that are showing on the screen, but it kind of shows you some of the different fact sheets that are available all for use.

Case studies, each one of the sites has case studies involved. We have 12 sites at North Island, six sites up at the Amphib base. I believe that's one of your next sheets is the case study with the two images, the two maps. It might be about three or four pages back. Each one of those is hyperlinked to the abbreviated case study.

I'll just pick Site 5. We were just talking about Site 5. And it talks about -- it talks about a brief snapshot of the site itself, and the next 15 pages in your handout are those

cast studies. I don't anticipate anybody reading all 15 pages right now. But for the next 15 pages it's just a long list of site case studies.

The Forum, like Steve mentioned, is an area that community members and RAB members can interact on a message board. You currently do not have a page for that in your book because that will not be -- it's been developed, but it's not been activated until we actually upload this to the Navy server.

And Tools and Resources, this is an area where you can download RAB guidance documents, DoD policy statements on Restoration Advisory Boards. There's fact sheets and tools and TAPP tools, which is the Technical Assistance for Public Participation. It's just an area of tools and resources.

Just a quick note. These are kind of our starting blocks. I imagine as time goes on over the quarters and years that these areas will be built out with additional tools and resources.

The IR Technology section has two basic areas: Best Management Practice and Contractors. I believe the next page that you have is I think three pages long which talks about some

Best Management Practices and techniques.

MR. SULLIVAN: This area has a link that will take you to an area called the Gapetto Remediation Technology Roundtable, and at that area there's a great resource that you can use for searching -- for example, some of the technology that we've discussed tonight. There's a number of different case studies that talk about ChemOx pilot programs and other areas in the country where other military installations have used some of the technology that they're talking about here tonight.

MR. ULMER: And one of the areas that will be added to this Best Management Practices and Techniques area that you do not see is the clu-in.org. They'll be a whole link there with a description of what that is. That's also another great resource for IR technologies.

And finally, the IR Connection is a system whereby you ask your question and it gets forwarded to the appropriate Board member based on what they're in charge of. Right now everything is going to Mr. John Locke; but as we build this out, they'll be more participating members in this scripting behind this technology.

MR. SULLIVAN: Just to kind of refresh your

memory, the way that will work is the hope that volunteers who receive communication about the IR connection, when a question is basically asked, there's a key word or a key wand based on, for example, if Bill says he wants to communicate all the technology questions, it will basically cue off of specific technology that are asked and it will go to him. That's the way that will work.

So really you're not going to have to waste a lot of time having to e-mail somebody who doesn't really have an idea and it gets forwarded or whatever. It should go to the person that is really interested in responding. So it helps to reduce the time.

And finally the feedback, which I think is the last page in your little handout, is just a quick form that anything people want to see added to the site. It's just a nice customer service philosophy. Of course, they'll be a "submit" button that's not shown, but a nice little area that -- we can always continue to grow this Web portal.

So that's where we stand. This is kind of what we're going -- this is what we're proposing for acceptance or approval, and now is the time if

anybody has any additional comments. I know last time the comment was to add a NELP Web link, which will happen.

If there's any additional comments -- additions, deletions, anybody know of anything else that they'd like to add, I guess this is the time to bring them to our attention before we go for final approval and upload to the site -- the Navy Web server.

MR. GEILENFELDT: When you talk about a Web link, you mean you can -- now, I'm not a computer whiz, so you can intertie or tie this information into other --

MR. ULMER: Yes.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Marilyn brought that up. You can get information from other RAB sites to correlate with what we have on this?

MR. ULMER: Right now the information at this RAB portal is only for NASNI. We imagine that as this continues to grow, other Restoration Advisory Board information will be added to this.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So you could interchange it.

MR. ULMER: Yes. But at this point it's just the information from NASNI only.

MR. CLARK: I notice you have NASNI and NAB on here. Is NAB not in there?

MR. ULMER: That image will link to the NAB Web site, yes.

MR. CLARK: So it's NBC now.

MS. FIELD: Do other RABs have Web sites like this?

MR. ULMER: They do, but not to this extent. Basically they just have an area where they post their meeting minutes and their transcripts and maybe some fact sheets, and that's it.

So this is like kind of a step out into really trying to touch the community, really trying to give them a place so they can interact. It's not just a bunch of downloads for transcripts and meeting minutes, which is what a lot of the other RABs do that.

MR. SULLIVAN: The majority of the other RAB portals are buried by the RAB. Information is buried in like an environmental site or facility, NAVFAC site. It's really not easily accessible for the public.

MR. COLLINS: I'm just curious, it would be nice, maybe, to have a link to a few other EPA type sites other than the one you did mention.

MR. ULMER: The clu-in?

MR. COLLINS: Right. For people that are interested. I know EPA maintains a lot of sites on the Web. There's probably some useful ones and some that aren't, and I don't know if maybe we need a link to DTSC and the Water Board to their sites.

MR. CORDERO: DTSC has their own site with its own regs and everything that's happening within DTSC. It would be nice if they could have that there.

I was wondering, though, in this site if like the names of the main project managers like Bill and John and Bob Geilenfeldt, will they be listed some place?

MR. ULMER: Yes. Right now we only have John Locke -- I didn't click on the contractors list -- but right now all I have for contractors is the two companies with the point of contact right now as it stands. Maybe in this area we change it to contractors and points of contact or something like that when we add both the contractors and the Navy side points of contact, which I think is a very good suggestion.

MR. SULLIVAN: You're thinking of all the RAB members, too; right?

MR. CORDERO: RAB members or even like DTSC for the main contacts. Bill is the main contact for all sites. So an easy link to go to the forum and ask a specific question, but sometimes some of the RAB members, they want to point questions to me.

MR. ULMER: I think that's a very good suggestion, and I think that that's something we'll make happen. Great suggestion.

MS. FIELD: How will community members know about that? Are you going to publicize this? What is the Web address?

MR. ULMER: Two good questions. Right now I'm working with the "Coronado Eagle" to potentially get some press coverage when this actually goes up so members of the community can actually log into the address that I'm about to give you and be able to really kind of take in what's going on, and hopefully that will increase some of the attendance of the public at these types of meetings.

Initially at our last meeting three months ago we talked about two different site names. Those two site names were www.nasni.navy.mil/rab and the other site name was

www.cnrsw.navy.mil/rab. So those are the two options. At the current time the Webmaster at the region has given us permission to go ahead and post this at the cnrsw.navy.mil/rab position.

So as it stands right now, the Web site here will be -- like I said. I hate to say it three times -- www.cnrsw.navy.mil/rab, unless otherwise decided tonight that we might go with the other one. But those are the two options, and that's the one we're leaning for right now.

MS. FIELD: It's a little -- it's not exactly catchy.

MR. ULMER: We wanted to go with something like nasnirab.com, but that didn't fly with the government.

DR. MARSHALL: Repeat it, please.

MR. ULMER: It is www.cnrsw.navy.mil/rab.

MR. SULLIVAN: Actually, if there's enough public concern about that, if you think it will influence people's ability to get to that information or not, it might be something that we need to bring up again because I think a lot of times folks that are in the IT world, the government can forget really what the purpose of this is for.

And really originally we wanted it to be very easy for people to remember. So if they see it in the paper, they don't have to go back to the paper and get a pen and write it down. It should be something very easy that they can grab a hold of and go back to their computer and plug it in.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Bill, we're having a flower show at Coronado here in April. We hand out literature, fliers, RAB information.

My question is is there some way we can get some kind of literature that shows all this dot dot dot www with handouts to someone?

MR. ULMER: One of the things that John and I were discussing is actually basically setting up a little computer thing -- and potentially you could talk about this in the next section of the meeting when you talk about the Flower Show -- but actually setting up a display unit where people can actually go up and kind of run through your Web site, if you'd like, at the Flower Show.

But, yes. Absolutely. We can get -- by the time the Flower Show is up, we will have the site locked down. We'll have it uploaded. We'll know what the Web site address is. We'll have all

that information for your availability.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I need to know that so I can get electricity at our booth.

MR. ULMER: Absolutely.

MR. CORDERO: A quick comment on that title. I know just -- our public participation specialist is not here, but I know the first thing they're going to say is "There's no way that's going to come up unless somebody did a search."

Do you know, Bill, or anybody what the hold up is? Do they have to have a navy.mil behind it? Is that the catch?

MR. COLLINS: I would say so.

MR. CORDERO: Then what's the problem with saying nasnirab.navy.mil?

MR. COLLINS: I have no idea because I'm not in that part of the world.

MR. CORDERO: It should be something so obvious that if somebody wants to look at it, they should be able to type in nasnirab on a search and, boom, it will come up.

MR. SULLIVAN: And there's ways to do that. If we go back to the IT folks, we can even use a dot com and have it pointed to the mil address.

So it's just -- I think we've gotten

enough feedback. How many community members here like the current address? How many people would prefer something easier?

MR. ULMER: Well, as Steve just mentioned -- and like I said, we've really got to readdress this with the IT folks, but you can always get navyrab.com and when you type that in, it forwards you to cnrsw.navy.mil/rab. So we're really hosting it on a Navy site, but we're buying a dot com to forward to that area, and that's a potential opportunity as well.

All these things have to be approved probably by people in the IT department, but if that's something that we need to discuss, that's something that we will pursue.

MR. SULLIVAN: It's happened before because the people in Mexico don't go to their dot mil addresses. They go to gonavy.com.

MR. CLARK: I guess since this is a combination of the two bases now is NBC, Naval Base Coronado, that might be a nice handle. It's another possibility.

MR. ULMER: Well, I think I can take them some feedback on the Web address as trying to get something that's more user friendly.

I've taken some input on getting a whole list of points of contact, not just contractors; and being able to link with a couple of the additional EPA technology sites and technology focused Web sites for the technology area.

Is there any other beyond those three that anybody can think of because I think we're going to try to post this prior to our next meeting. So if our next meeting is in a couple of months, this will have been approved by then. This is really the last opportunity for input.

MR. CORDERO: And you said more technological sites for EPA. You might want to add DTSC and the Water Board, since we're the two main state agencies. And the Air Board, too, because they contribute all the time.

So if they have links to it, this would be what they want to know specifically with DTSC or EPA or how the Water Board operates or new regs they put out, then they can go directly to those Web sites.

MR. ULMER: We'll make that happen.

MR. LOCKE: Does Leticia, does she want to provide input to this?

MR. CORDERO: I'll advise her on what was said, and I'll give her -- actually, I'll take another copy of this to give to her. Leticia is assigned to another base right now. They happened to fall on the same night. She apologized for not being able to be here. She said she will be here for the Flower Show. She'll be volunteering.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Tell Leticia I appreciate that.

MR. CORDERO: I'm pretty sure her comment -- her response to me was "I trust what you'll say." So if anybody's going to get beat up about it, it will be me.

MR. ULMER: Thank you.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Thank you.

MR. LOCKE: And this is going to be a living Web page. We're going to change it as we go. When we put it up, hopefully, this is going to stay in that one state.

MR. ULMER: After every meeting, there should be new stuff to upload is my philosophy.

MR. GEILENFELDT: The next item on the agenda is the Coronado Flower Show.

It's our second annual Flower Show booth. The Coronado Flower Show this year is

April 13th and April 14th. The purpose of having the booth is to inform the public, as you know, with the idea of possibly creating some more membership interest.

Last year our success rate at the next meeting was not too hot. We're going to suggest another alternative this year, possibly to get some more interest.

The Flower Show requires volunteers. As you know, last year we had some very good members attending to help us with manning the booth. And this is very important. We are required by the chairman of the Flower Show to have two manned individuals on this booth during the hours -- and those hours you have on this little green folder -- Saturday, April 13th we have the Flower Show 1:00 to 5:30 p.m. So it's only half a day on Saturday. Sunday it's all day. Actually, not all day but from 10:00 to 4:00 p.m.

Again, I appreciate any volunteers who will be willing to help us man this booth. Keep that in mind.

The second stage, of course, is to be sure that we can count on you gentlemen to provide us with the proper display. Last year we had an

outstanding display.

MR. COLLINS: We have it.

MR. GEILENFELDT: And we can use that same one?

How do you feel about that, Foster? Does that display sound --

DR. MARSHALL: Pretty good, yeah.

MR. GEILENFELDT: It seemed to draw some attention, other than having a girl there with a bikini on.

DR. MARSHALL: And the rain hurt a little bit last time, too. I think if it's a clear day, you'll get a lot of response.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Saturday was the day we had a little bit of inclement weather, but Sunday seemed to be a little better. But we had excellent activity at the booth, I felt. There was a lot of interest. I mean, you all speak up.

I felt that it was worthwhile, and I feel that we should continue it, even though we did not have any new members. In fact, I think Foster brought up the idea of getting a membership prospect list, as we used to call it in the insurance business, where we would get names and phone numbers. Instead of just saying, "Hey, come

to the next meeting" and give them a flier, get a phone call follow-up list, and I will personally call these people and try to generate some more activity. People do not remember from April to May that there's going to be a meeting. You can feed them all this information and when they walk out of there, it's gone. It goes into File 13. You have to follow-up with a follow-up call.

MR. LOCKE: Agree.

MR. GEILENFELDT: So if we could have some type of a list or like these outlines we have for people to sign in, we could use something similar to that for their names, addresses, and phone numbers.

MR. COLLINS: We'll have something there they can sign up on.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I would appreciate it.

MR. COLLINS: We'll also have a new fact sheet for North Island. We'll use the same one for or pretty much the same one for NAB since there's nothing really happening.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Something to hand out.

This recent flier that I received from John, Fact Sheet No. 13 about Site 5 - Unit 2, I thought that was very well prepared. Something

like this would be ideal.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Since this was a hot item, it might be of interest to those individuals who walk up to the booth.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. GEILENFELDT: We talked about the sign-up sheet. You're going to work on that.

We also have the possibility of having some Web site information here. That would be great. If we are intending to do that, I need to let Carol Cartwright, who runs the -- who's the manager of the Flower Show, I need to let her know about electricity needs at the booth.

One more point is the booth we had last year is also available this year. If you all recall, we were in the process of the exit area, and we were on the north side, but we have options for other booths there.

My question is were you happy with the booth site that we had or would you want me to request a different site? There are about half a dozen little booths.

MR. COLLINS: It's fine with me.

MR. GEILENFELDT: That one seemed to be very

excellent as far as the traffic.

DR. MARSHALL: It had a nice tree, too, for shade.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Good point. So I will request the same booth. Volunteers?

DR. MARSHALL: I'll be there on Saturday, as best I know, but we'll have to check with the boss.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Can I count on anyone on Sunday?

MR. COLLINS: I'll be there both days.

MR. CORDERO: I'll get back to you, Bob, on Leticia, which day or both days. We'll be there.

MR. GEILENFELDT: That will be great.

MR. PERRY: I'll be there on one of the days. I have to check my calendar.

MR. GEILENFELDT: And you are?

MR. PERRY: I'm Charles Perry. I'm the new RPM at South Bay.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Are you familiar with the location of the Flower Show? You've not been there before?

MR. PERRY: I can find it.

MR. GEILENFELDT: It's right in the middle of Coronado right at Spreckles Park. It's on Saturday and Sunday. If you can make yourself

present there at the booth, we'll be right as you come in the entrance. Just tell them you're with the RAB Advisory Board booth or the Navy. Tell them the Navy booth. They will know which one. There's a couple ways to go in, but you just come in in front. If you have any conflict or they want a fee to get in, just tell them to holler at one of us, and we'll come over there and get you in because we can see the entrance right there from our booth.

I appreciate your participation. We're going to try a little different approach and see if we can't gain some membership. Last time we -- I feel that our program was of value. I feel that we did reach quite a few people. I just think we didn't follow-up properly. That's my main concern. So this time we're going to take advantage of what we learned and try something new.

MR. COLLINS: We should put a notice in the paper, too.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I would appreciate that.

Also, it would help, John, as I mentioned to you earlier, if we could send a letter of confirmation to Carol Cartwright, the lady that's in charge, that we are intending to be there

and we would like the same booth space as we had last year. My wife went to the Coronado Flower Show luncheon today, and she may have gotten that across, but I still think it's important that we get some kind of a formal notice to them that we intend to be there.

MR. LOCKE: Be glad to.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Any other questions about what we're planning to do here? Any other suggestions or improvement that you can recommend, we'd appreciate it. We're kind of walking in the dark here. We're learning.

Next item is public comment, questions and answers.

MS. FIELD: I have a question.

It's unrelated to anything we've talked about tonight, but a long time ago you were talking about a study to see what kind of munitions might be at the bottom of the bay, and I've noticed that there is a barge out in the bay really right very near where I live.

MR. GEILENFELDT: I noticed that the other day.

MS. FIELD: It's been there for several weeks, and there's a crane on it and a truck, and

their people are being ferried back and forth to it, and I wondered -- and when I called the Harbor Police to ask about this, they said it was a Navy operation. I wondered if this was part of the munitions study or if you knew anything about it.

MR. COLLINS: It's not part of any munitions study, and I don't know what program it's out there for unless --

MR. CLARK: Oh, isn't that the north side of the bridge or are you talking about the south side?

MR. LOCKE: North side.

MR. GEILENFELDT: It's near the fishing dock.

MS. FIELD: It's near where the ferry comes in.

MR. CLARK: I was on duty with the police on Monday, and they were operating in there, but that didn't look like a Navy operation.

MS. FIELD: That's what the Harbor Police told me.

MR. COLLINS: It may be part of the project for the wharf we built for the next carrier because they had a pipeline running from that site through the bay all the way around to the bird sanctuary area, that enhancement island or whatever they want

to call the mud pile, and that's how they delivered all of the sediment to that site rather than truck it through town. It went by pipeline. So there's a chance if it is a Navy operation, they might need to recover that pipeline and take it off the bottom of the bay. Other than that, I can't imagine why we'd have a crane out there.

And the best thing to do would be to call the public -- they'd use a crane anyway to lift the pipeline segments up. So other than that, call the public affairs officer at North Island and he can find out for you exactly what's going on.

MR. GEILENFELDT: The island is in process. I don't know if you've gone out and seen the nature overlook. You can see where the island is taking shape.

MS. FIELD: I haven't seen that.

Whatever happened to the munitions study?

MR. COLLINS: The preliminary assessment was completed, and I believe later this year there will be some investigations in the bay. But that site is actually assigned to Naval Station, so we don't really know everything that's going on.

MR. GEILENFELDT: "That site," you mean the

bird sanctuary site?

MR. COLLINS: No. The bay itself. The project to look for old munitions and stuff, it had to be assigned to one base or another. It's assigned to Naval Station for management.

MS. FIELD: By that you mean 32nd Street?

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Any other questions?

Shall we discuss the upcoming RAB meetings?

MR. COLLINS: Yes. Some of us are convinced we've had our room stolen.

MS. BOYD: I have to tell you there was nobody in that room when I left there, and I was so mad. I talked with the librarian, and she said "Yes, there's someone in there." There was no one in there.

MR. COLLINS: We want to thank Anita for being our watchdog at the door.

Well, we have our next meeting on May 16th. We voted for the third Thursday before, and we will have that one at the library. After that the library goes into construction, so we'll have to find a place for the next meeting in August and then again in November. If this works out okay,

maybe we can meet here those times.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Now that we know where it is.

MS. FIELD: Actually, in some ways it's better. There's more parking.

MR. COLLINS: If they had an air conditioner that they're willing to run in the summer -- we'll shoot for this room then for August and November. And, once again, the third Thursday. There's also a room in the building that has the police station. They have a nice room upstairs.

MR. GEILENFELDT: That's used for one of the other local organizations, Coronado Residential Association. Don't they have their meetings in the police station?

MR. COLLINS: At night?

MR. GEILENFELDT: After 5:00, yes. The CRA has their meetings there. It's a detached building across from the library.

MR. COLLINS: We can look into that and if that fails, we'll contact the city about the city hall.

MR. CLARK: Well, one thing about that room, they don't use air conditioning for the meetings in there, and even at this time of the year, it would

be nice.

MR. COLLINS: It's still a nice room. We'll try this one first. If that fails, we'll shoot for the others.

So the August meeting will be on the 15th and the 21st of November.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Items for the next RAB meeting?

MS. FIELD: Flower show discussion.

MR. COLLINS: We'll have the usual Site 9 update. New RAB member introductions.

MR. GEILENFELDT: We have a new member that could not come tonight. She called me -- I can't remember her name. She called and said she couldn't make it. She had to be out of town. So there was activity. People were aware of this meeting and aware of the date change because we originally planned this on the 21st.

MR. CLARK: Speaking of membership, I may very well be terminating mine within the next month or two. We'll probably be moved to Big Bear.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Any other items for discussion? Shall we have a request for adjournment?

DR. MARSHALL: Adjourn.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Second?

MR. CLARK: Second.

MR. GEILENFELDT: Done.

(Whereupon, at 8:25 p.m. the RAB meeting was adjourned.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

: SS

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)

I, Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the above proceedings on Thursday, February 28, 2002, at 550 "F" Street, in the City of Coronado, County of San Diego, State of California; and I do further certify that the above and foregoing pages numbered 1 to 79, inclusive, contain a true and correct transcript of all of said proceeding?

Dated: _____, 2002.

_____

NANCY A. LEE